

Written Report Criteria

FSHN 421

| Criteria | Excellent 4 | Good 3 | Fair 2 | Poor 1 |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Abstract | Summarizes goal of project and results concisely. Specific information provided. | Most information is presented, but some items may be missing. | Insufficient summary of what was done. Few specific results presented. | Abstract is missing or contains no specific information. |
| Introduction | Discusses why the study was done, and what hypothesis was tested. Presents background information, with references, relevant to the study. | Gives general description of the purpose of the study, but some relevant background information may be missing. | Some information on the purpose of the study is given, but no background or references provided. | Provides little or no information on why the study was done. No background information given. |
| Materials and Methods | Concisely describes methods or gives references to sources of methods used. Product handling well described. | Methods generally are well described or referenced, but some items may be insufficiently described or left out. | Methods may be insufficiently explained, or may be described in too much detail. Large gaps in information. | Most key pieces of information are missing. References to methods aren't provided. |
| Results | Data are presented in one or more tables, with accompanying text to introduce the tables. Figures are used to illustrate key comparisons or trends. No errors in calculations. | Data tables are presented, but some calculations may be in error, some data may be missing, or figures may be insufficient. | Insufficient data are presented, or several errors in calculations are present and distract from the results. Text and/or figures may be missing. | Raw data are missing. Reported counts are calculated incorrectly. No text to present the results. No figures or alternative methods of data presentation. |
| Discussion | Clearly discusses what results mean and what conclusions may be drawn from them. Cites published standards or other related reports. | Generally clear discussion of results and conclusions, but may miss some points. Some use of references and published standards. | Limited discussion of results and conclusions. Little or no reference to published standards or other reports. | Reader can gain very little information about why the project was done and what the results may mean. No reference to other studies. |
| References | Includes references to methods, related studies, and standards, all complete and in appropriate style. | Appropriate references are generally present; some may be incomplete or in incorrect style. | Few references are given. Style is incorrect and/or incomplete. | No references provided. |
| Style | Writing is free of errors in grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling. Uses passive voice. Flows smoothly. Logical connection of points. Follows standard journal paper style. | Writing is generally error-free and in passive voice. Sentence flow is generally smooth and logical. Journal paper style is generally followed. Minor errors may be present. | Writing has some errors but these are not too distracting. Voice may change randomly. Flow is not consistently smooth; appears disjointed. Journal paper style is not followed consistently. | Errors are frequent and distracting, so that it is hard to determine meaning. No logical connection of ideas or flow of sentences. Journal paper style is not followed. |